

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

**DRAWING AMENDMENTS:**

Attached hereto are the formal replacement drawing sheets containing Figs. 7, 8, 9 and Figs. 10 through 12. The enclosed replacement sheets include the corrections noted in the Examiner's action.

Fig. 8 has been corrected to more clearly illustrate that the members 42A and 42B are interrupted threads.

Also, the reference numeral 50A has been added to Figs. 9 and 12 to indicate the flattened portion of the retaining ring 51.

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

## R E M A R K S

Reconsideration of the application is requested. Claims 1, 5, 10 and 12 are now the only claims retained in the application. Of these, Claims 5, 10 and 12 have been indicated as being allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections noted in the Examiner's action of April 7, 2005.

Accordingly, Claim 10 has been amended so as to obviate the formalities noted in paragraph 3e of the Examiner's action. It is therefore submitted that Claim 10 is now in proper form for allowance. Claim 12, which is rendered dependent upon Claim 10, is likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 has been written in independent form so as to incorporate the subject matter of Claims 2 and 3, upon which Claim 5 depended. As rewritten, Claim 5 obviates the noted objections rendered in the Examiner's action and is therefore now in condition for allowance.

The rejection of Claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Fahnestock is noted. In an effort to obviate the Examiner's objection under 35 USC 102(b), Claim 1 has been further amended to more particularly define Applicant's invention over Fahnestock.

Claim 1, as currently amended, is directed to a connector body having an inlet end and an outlet end wherein the outlet end

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

includes a pair of spaced apart shoulders and an outer surface disposed between said shoulders. The claim further specifies that the respective shoulders extend radially outwardly of the outlet end. As amended, Claim 1 also requires that an annular retainer ring be supported directly on the shoulders and spaced from the outer surface of said outlet end which is disposed between the spaced apart shoulders to define a relief space between said annular retainer ring and said outer surface of said outlet end.

Also, the claim provides for a plurality of spring tangs blanked out of said retainer ring whereby said tangs are circumferentially spaced about the retaining ring and projecting outwardly of the retaining ring in a cantilevered manner. The claim also requires that the tangs be spaced above said outer surface of the outlet end so that upon insertion of the outlet end through the knock out hole, the tangs are free to deflect into said relief space to reduce the force required for inserting the connector through a knock out hole of an electric box.

Clearly, the reference to Fahnestock does not remotely suggest or disclose the structure as now defined in Claim 1. It is to be noted that Fahnestock discloses a connector device in which the alleged shoulders 11 and 12 cannot be equated to Applicant's shoulders, referenced by numerals 13 and 14. As is

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

clearly disclosed in Fahnestock, the shoulder 11 extends radially outwardly of shoulder 12 by a substantial greater distance.

Because of the different radial differences between shoulder 11 and 12 of Fahnestock, the retainer ring 15 of Fahnestock cannot be supported on shoulders 11 and 12 of Fahnestock. Shoulder 11 of Fahnestock serves to limit the degree or distance in which the connector can be inserted through a knock out hole.

Also, Claim 1 is patentably distinguished over Fahnestock in that the claim requires the annular retainer ring to be supported directly on the spaced apart shoulders. Since Fahnestock shoulders 11 and 12 are of different radial lengths, the retaining ring 15 cannot be supported on the Fahnestock shoulders 11 and 12 as contemplated by Applicant's structure.

Applicant's claim also requires that the annular retainer ring be spaced above the outer surface of the end portion to define a relief space between the annular retaining ring and the outer surface of said outlet end. In Fahnestock, the retaining ring 15 is supported by the outer surface of the connector body which extends between shoulders 11 and 12 of Fahnestock's structure and not on the shoulders 11 and 12.

It is also to be noted that the free end of Fahnestock's tang 16 also is in contact with the outer surface of the connector body outlet end, as indicated in Figs. 1, 2, and 3 of

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

Fahnestock. In Fahnestock, the free end of tang 15 is slightly bowed so as to be flexed so as to permit insertion of the connector through the knock out hole. Since Fahnestock does not have a relief space defined between the retainer ring and the outer surface of the connector body, the free end of the tangs 16 is forced against the outer surface of the outlet end which imparts a force on the tang 16 to resist the deflection of the tang 16 as the connector is inserted through a knock out hole. Since the tang 16 of Fahnestock is not free to deflect into a relief space, as contemplated in Applicant's structure, it should be apparent that a greater force is required to effect the deflection of the tang 16 where both ends of the tang are in direct contact with the outer surface of the outlet end. Since such retainer ring are formed of spring steel, a substantial amount of force will be required to force Fahnestock's structure through a knock out hole. With Applicant's structure, a relief space is provided to enhance the deflection of the tang and thereby reduce the amount of force required in inserting the connector through a knock out hole.

In reviewing the Fahnestock patent, it is noted that the retainer ring is not supported on the shoulders. Fahnestock expressly shows that the retaining ring 15 is supported on the outer surface of the outlet end, which is disposed between

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

shoulders 12 and 11, so as to provide some longitudinal movement of the retainer ring 15 in an axial direction between shoulders 11 and 12 so as to provide for the elongation of the tangs 16 as it is forced through the knock out hole. Reference is made to col. 1, lines 50-60 of the Fahnestock reference. It is submitted that Claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Fahnestock under 35 USC 102(b).

It is further submitted that Claim 1, as now amended, does not introduce any new subject matter so as to require any additional search or other consideration. Claim 1, as now amended, is directed to the same subject matter which has been previously claimed and as previously argued. Applicant merely seeks to more particularly point out the distinctions between the subject matter of Claim 1 and the Fahnestock reference. Since Fahnestock does not disclose each and every element as recited in Claim 1 and/or in the particular cooperative arrangement of the claimed elements, it is not understood how Fahnestock can be anticipatory under 35 USC 102(b).

The law of anticipation has been well settled. It has been consistently held that in order to anticipate under 35 USC 102(b), the invention must have been known to the art in the details of the claims; that is, all of the elements and limitations of the claims must be shown in a single prior art

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

reference and arranged as set forth in the claims. Karsten Manufacturing Corp. v. Cleveland Golf Company cited at 58 USPQ 2d 1286, 1291, (Fed Cir 2001) and citing C.R. Bard, Inc. v. M3 Systems, Inc. 48 USPQ 2d 1225, 1229-30 (Fed Cir 1998) and Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Company, 9 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir 1989). Clearly, Fahnestock does not disclose or anticipate the subject matter to which amended Claim 1 is now directed, as Fahnestock does not disclose each and every limitation as now recited in amended Claim 1, nor does Fahnestock disclose the arrangement in which the claim elements are being claimed.

It is therefore submitted that Claim 1, as amended herein, clearly patentably defines over the art of record, where the claimed subject matter is structurally and functionally patentably distinct over Fahnestock and produces a result not contemplated in Fahnestock.

The Specification has also been amended to update the information about the related patent application referred to at the beginning of page 1, which has now been granted a U.S. Patent 6,860,758 B1.

Applicant is also submitting herewith two formal replacement drawing sheets containing Figs. 7 through 13, which include the corrections necessary to obviate the Examiner's objections to the drawings.

10/790,238  
P-2464/CIP

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the application is now in proper form for an allowance and a prompt notice of an allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



---

ARTHUR T. FATTIBENE,  
Attorney for Applicant  
2480 Post Road  
Southport, CT 06890  
Reg. No. 17,804  
Phone: 203-255-4400;  
Fax: 203-259-0033